



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,941	06/25/2001	Theresa A. Burkes	10008291-1	9288

7590 03/16/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BROOKS, MATTHEW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/888,941	Applicant(s) BURKES ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew L. Brooks	Art Unit 3629	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew L. Brooks.

(2) James D. Shaurette.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 March 2006

Time: Not sure, before 2 pm eastern.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 15, 19, 22-24

Prior art documents discussed:

Muta et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)



(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Applicant was advised/directed to the allowable subject matter of the claims in particular was advised if Claims 22-24 are canceled, claim 19 rolled into 15 to clarify the triggering event for the timestamp is the production of a specified number of units of output and claim 2 rolled into 1 to overcome possible 101 rejections in that the stamp would not merely reside in a memory.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The substance of the interview was focused on the claim language particularly the addition of "computer readable" as the type of memory in claim 1 step c (and other appropriate claims). Further the the Applicant was advised that claim 1 step d (and other appropriate claims) should read as "...warranty start event comprises production of a specified quantity of output greater than one." Applicant was not satisfied with the "greater than one" and wanted "greater than zero". The "zero" however would create serious novelty problems because if the claim said a quantity greater than zero then, in the case of a printer or other item, as soon as it printed the first page that would in all actuality be the same as the "first use".

NOTE: 1.) Examiner and Applicant agreed to resume discussion of Application after discussion of recommendations with client. This next meetin will take place by telephone on March 16th, 2 PM Eastern, when Applicant calls Examiner at 571-272-8112.

2.) Examiner turns only for purposes of this explanation to Rydbeck PN 6,519,470 abstract which shows that it was known in the art to determine when a devices warranty period begins based upon a first use date, the time for which is received via a network and stored as a time stamp in a computer readable medium. Therefore it is of the Examiners opinion at this point that in order for the claims to be allowable the time stamp should be generated after a specified production of output greater than one which in direct allignment with Applicant's true invention.

3.) Attorney is advised to refer/look at the Rydbeck reference. Claim 1 which is equivalent to start event of output = to 1 (>0).

4.) Applicant's drawings have been approved.